ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE IN THE EUROPEAN REGIONS

GUISÁN, María Carmen
eccgs@usc.es
FRÍAS, Isidro
ecsmsif@usc.es
Faculty of Economics
University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)

EURO-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Working paper nº 9

Serie: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Disponible en/Available in:

www.usc.es/economet/aea.htm

http://ideas.uqam.ca/ideas/data/eaaecodev.html

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE IN THE EUROPEAN REGIONS

GUISÁN, María Carmen
eccgs@usc.es
FRÍAS, Isidro
ecsmsif@usc.es
Faculty of Economics
University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)
http://www.usc.es/economet

ABSTRACT:

The differences among the regions of Europe are not only those of income and employment, but there are many other important and different circumstances affecting social welfare: education, health, justice or public satisfaction with government institutions. The purpose of this paper will be to analyse the differences among regions by means of social welfare and economic indicators. Furthermore, with the use of econometric models, we will identify the causal factors underlying these varying circumstances.

1- INTRODUCTION

The concern for social well-being has been a frequent concern in the study of socio-economic investigation in the last decades. The revival of such concern has re-surfaced in the last few years.

This has been due to the possibility of having at our disposal, for the first time, indicators from an intense project by the national and international statistical organisations.

The Pekin Conference, and others of the like, have contributed in great degree to the awareness over the problems encountered by human development, both in developed as well as in the less developed countries.

The greater availability of data and social interest provide the required scenario to advance in the study and avoid the confusion that can come about from the use of unrealistic index numbers; for example, the UN`s index for human development (1995a); or, similarly, the mixture of the representative indicators with others that bring about confusion, or that should not be included, as is the case in the UN`s index for female participation (1995b).

In section 4 , we briefly discuss the evident problems with the indices.

In this paper we apply social well-being indicators to the regional data published by Eurostat and complemented by other sources of statistical information. Both with the availability of data and social interest, we must also add that the sentiment shared by many relevant investigators concerned for the weak socio- political relation of the European regions are backed by the efforts in the investigations in regional science.

It is important to support ERSA as to their achieving the required results from both the national and European parliament investigators, as well as considering public opinion.

In our analysis we propose to measure the relevant impact on the level of spiritual and

material well- being in several aspects of personal development:

1) Domestic Well- being
2) Labour Well- being
3) Social Well-being
4) Public Well-being

Parting from the acknowledgement that all European regions and countries included in this study find themselves, in general terms, to be at a much higher level than the world's average, what must be taken into consideration is that many problems are existent in these regions which are capable of being solved, ie. life`s injustices, insecurities and lack of freedom for adopting plausible solutions.

The next section describes the indicators and the method adopted for obtaining these. Our emphasis is both centred on distinguishing the areas as well as selecting each variable so that they adequately reflect the quantity and quality of well- being.

Even though we elaborate a suitable indicators, based on our own chosen weights, we want to highlight that the merit of the analysis is in valuing each one of the components and that the weights adopted change not only among researchers but also within the same individual according to each moment in time.

It is all logically subject to perfectionism, but we believe this study assumes a marked political contribution to the indicators for social well- being in the international data available.

2- SOCIO-ECONOMIC WELL-BEING INDICATORS

The disposable data taken from the main source, ie. Eurostat´s Statistical Yearbook, conditions the grouping of data in 98 regions that are composed by the 12 countries that constituted the EC. Therefore, in Germany's case, it only included data from west Germany.

The latest data available in 1996 was that from 1991. We have completed the data from

other sources available to us from the UN, OECD; Eurostat´s social statistics and our own estimations for missing data. In these estimations, we have used what we have considered most relevant in each case.

Generally, the results are representative of the socio-economic situation for each region. It should be mentioned here that the results for some regions encounter their special circumstances, for example, in Spain's case, the Balearic Islands. Here GDP per head over-estimates the level of family income per head due to the high degree of tourist activity in relation to the population in the area; other examples of over- estimation are that of Luxembourg; where the indicator for public sector activity is over-valued possibly as a result of being a focal area for the Community's Institution; and that of Hamburg that encounters problems similar to that seen in the Balearic Islands, ie. the pronounced influence on the weight for economic activity due to their high value added from their harbour activities.

The economic differences between the regions or countries have been smoothened by the use of Purchasing Power Parities (PPP), instead of using exchange rates which exaggerate the economic living standards.

We have used Distance indicators , referred to in the Annex, which have allowed us to elaborate the following indicators for well-being (IW) - the higher the values of these indexes the higher the regional level of well-being.

IW1 = Index for Domestic Economic Well-being
IW2 = Index for Employment Opportunities
IW3 = Index for Education and Research
IW4 = Index for Health Assistance
IW5 = Index for Public Services and Infrastructure
IW6 = Index for Female Participation

We have also elaborated other indicators; economic well-being (IWE), socio-cultural (IWS), and public services (including infrastructural development) (IWP). From these we have elaborated others.

IWE represents the level of family economic well-being : domestic economy, employment and health assistance. The formula is:

$$IWE= 0.60 * IW1 + 0.20 * IW2 + 0.20 * IW4$$

IWS represents the level of socio-cultural standards, very important for the socio cultural and economic development.

$$IWS = (IW3 + IW6)/2$$

IWP represents the level of public infrastructure and services.

$$IWP = IW5$$

This indicator is as such because we do not have wider data available to us.

Due to the lack of available data, we have been unable to include indicators for the quality of these public services, which would be useful as the differences between the administration departments of some countries are significantly large, especially in relation to the excessive burocracy that has a negative effect on quality.

The Indicator for Total Well-being has been calculated as follows:

$$IWT = 0.60 * IWE + 0.20 * IWS + 0.20 * IWP$$

The following tables present the medium, maximum and minimum results for the regions of each country for the sintetic indicators of Family Economic Well-being (IWE), the Well-being with respect to the Society´s educational and cultural level (IWS) and the Well-being with respect to the quantitative development of Public services (IWP).

Economic Well-being Indicator (IWE)

IWE is the most correlated to the level of VAB per head, with a correlation coefficient of 0.93 in the group of the 98 regions for 1990, and reaches the highest levels in Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, France and Denmark, with values exceeding 40. A more moderate value is that reached by Italy and United Kingdom, with a middle value greater than 35.

Bellow this level we have, in descending order Spain (28), Ireland (20), Greece (17) and Portugal (16). The value for Portugal is possibly over-valued due to the problems encountered with Purchasing Power Parities (PPP), discussed in the Annex.

Some regions reach very high levels, especially in Germany and Belgium, reaching the maximum superior to 80, and France´s maximum, corresponding to the region Ille de France (around Paris) with 68.

The more disadvantaged regions are found in countries with a level below the medium value.

Table 1. IWE

	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
1. España	28.21	41.72	10.72
2. Denmark	44.16	44.16	44.16
3. Italy	38.83	52.21	20.88
4. Germany	56.09	80.86	44.59
5. Belgium	56.34	86.07	38.53
6. Netherland	47.70	51.88	44.66
7. Luxembourg	59.44	59.44	59.44
8. Ireland	20.93	20.93	20.93
9. United Kingdom	35.71	46.38	30.77
10. Portugal	17.46	30.38	8.83
11. Greece	15.62	21.17	12.33
12. France	45.73	68.57	37.64

TOTAL	39.52	86.07	8.83

Socio-cultural Well-being Indicator (IWS)

We use the term "socio-cultural" to refer to the measure of progress reached by each society in important areas such as the value given to education, scientific investigation, promoting women's opportunities, etc. In other words a free and dynamic society, with the rights and liberties due, that offer an ample range of opportunities for personal as well as social development.

The indicators used reflect the level reached by each region. Some of them, especially those referring to the social and job opportunity for women, are only available in general for national levels and therefore, regional differences within each country do not appear at present. Our intention is to supply and complement this indicator with new information.

This indicator is also related to VAB per head but to a lesser degree than IWE with a correlation coefficient 0.54.

The results clearly show that the differences in the socio-cultural atmosphere are greater than that demonstrated by IWE indicator amongst the countries. Thus, the maximum distance from the mean value of the IWS Indicator is found between Denmark (75.64) and Spain (14.71), with a ratio between both values, equal to 5.14.

In the case of the IWE indicator, the ratio between the maximum and minimum is 3.8 and is possibly a little over valued.

Levels as high as that for Denmark in the IWS indicator are reached in all of Germany's regions, with values lying between 62.90 and 70.91. All regions of Belgium, Netherlands, United Kingdom and France attain greater values than 40.

Portugal is situated around 30 in all its regions and Greece around 19. Spain occupies the last place with region values for this indicator between 12.5 and 19.21

Some of Spain's more advanced regions are under valued as some of the components included in these indicators are greater for these regions than the national values used here . Such differences will be taken into account in a next study.

Table 2. IWS

	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
1. España	14.71	19.21	12.35
2. Denmark	75.64	75.64	75.64
3. Italy	36.51	40.53	33.53
4. Germany	67.11	70.91	62.90
5. Belgium	41.35	43.09	40.00
6. Netherland	46.80	47.62	46.16
7. Luxembourg	32.20	32.20	32.20
8. Ireland	29.23	29.23	29.23
9. United Kingdom	55.71	58.38	53.94
10. Portugal	29.39	30.82	28.25
11. Greece	18.63	18.78	18.45
12. France	52.98	61.83	49.80
TOTAL	42.04	75.64	12.35

Public services quantitative indicator (IWP)

The indicator for quantitative development of Public Services (IWP) reflects the number employed in the Public Sector in various services: administration, justice, health, education, police, etc. and the investment in public service infrastructure such as roads. The availability of more regional data will allow the improvement of the quantitative indicator and also produce a qualitative indicator, for which questionnaires carried out on the quality of each service are of great interest.

The availability of more detailed data on employment in the social and community

services both in the public and private sector , will allow a more precise analysis of the well-being of these services, on the lines of the analysis carried out by GUISAN (1995) comparing the levels of Germany, Spain, USA and Japan, but for now, these set of data are not available for the majority of countries in this study.

The correlation coefficient with VAB per head is 0.52, very similar to IWS, and lower than IWE.

Taking into account all these considerations and giving a provisional character to the conclusions reached in this analysis, we can highlight in the IWP data, that the highest middle values correspond to Denmark, which stands out with such a high level at 76.15, and Luxembourg, United Kingdom, Germany and Belgium with middle values superior to 40. At a more moderate level, are Italy, Netherlands and France with values superior to 25.

Spain, Ireland and Portugal lie around 20 and Greece finds itself considerably below this, with a value of 7, for which this value is possibly under valued as a consequence of the provisional character of the estimated data in this country.

The ratio between the maximum and minimum of the national middle values is 10.62, considerably high, but if we omit the data for Greece, the value falls to 3.8.

In various countries, greater interregional differences are apparent in the IWS and IWP indicators than in the Economic Indicator IWE. What can also be appreciated form some countries like the UK is that they display great regional homogeneity for the three indicators, whilst others like Spain have considerable differences.

Table 3. IWP

	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
1. España	20.16	40.32	12.74
2. Denmark	76.15	76.15	76.15
3. Italy	31.20	45.93	18.31
4. Germany	45.45	59.45	35.11
5. Belgium	44.10	88.39	19.94
6. Netherland	27.13	38.08	20.28
7. Luxembourg	59.44	59.44	59.44
8. Ireland	20.93	20.93	20.93
9. United Kingdom	56.73	62.70	49.78
10. Portugal	19.82	31.27	13.55
11. Greece	7.17	9.77	4.73
12. France	27.68	45.73	20.69
TOTAL	32.41	88.39	4.73

Table 4, presents the correlation coefficients between IWi and VAB90H.

Table 4. Correlations Coefficients.

	VAB90H
IW1	0.9871
IW2	0.9438
IW3	0.5501
IW4	0.5310
IW5	0.5032
IW6	0.4151
IWE	0.9418
IWS	0.5418
IWP	0.5032
IWT	0.8873

As expected, by comparing the development of GDP per head with the index for Domestic Economic Well-being (IW1), a high correlation is seen, due to the fundamental role played by this variable to explain the capacity of expenditure for each family.

Employment Opportunities (IW2) are affected by other factors, where GDP per head is not as important as how it figures in the previous index. Furthermore, other factors (employment legislation, ie. part-time opportunities, social security payments...) affect this variable within the regions and countries, differentiating them from the rest.

Education (IW3) is greatly affected by other elements other than GDP per head. What should be taken into account here, is that the relationship between and amongst the components for the index and GDP per head (at economic level) is different; some have a positive impact on growth (D3B and D3D); others depend on wealth (D3C); and D3B does not display as clear a relationship as the previous because it is affected by the massification of students, as is the case for Spain.

The IW3, IW4, IW5 and IW6 indicators are clearly affected by socio-cultural factors and by the evolution of the public services sector (health, education, infrastructure, etc.) and hence, its correlation with GDP per head is lower than is the case for IW1 and IW2.

3. ECONOMETRIC MODELS

With the object of analysing the inter-relations between the IWE, IWS, IWP indicators, we have estimated 3 equations. All of them include dummy variables that take into account specific national and regional effects.

The variables Di (i= 1,2,.....12) are national dummies, corresponding to the numbering of the countries.

1- Spain	7- Luxembourg
2- Denmark	8- Ireland
3- Italy	9- United Kingdom
4- Germany	10 - Portugal
5- Belgium	11- Greece
6- Holland	12- France

Letter C (constant) in the tables for the equations is the intercept, acting as the country of reference, France.

Di´s are included where a country's i presents a significant difference from C, when they do not they are the same as the intercept's.

The variables Dri (i= 1,2,.....98) are regional dummies corresponding to the numbering for the regions. These are found in the table within the Annex. DRPj and DRNj are dummies linked to groups or regions with special positive or negative effects.

Results of Estimation Equation 1.

LS // Dependent Variable is IWE
Sample: 1 98
Included observations: 98

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
IWP	0.400336	0.060737	6.591329	0.0000
IWS	0.350032	0.038934	8.990434	0.0000
C	16.53290	2.014270	8.207887	0.0000
D2	-29.33492	4.645477	-6.314727	0.0000
D7	22.63250	3.931035	5.757390	0.0000
D8	-20.20640	3.986345	-5.068904	0.0000
D9	-24.11099	2.035290	-11.84646	0.0000
D10	-17.29863	2.116691	-8.172488	0.0000
D11	-10.30941	2.658612	-3.877744	0.0002
DRN1	-11.72785	2.127383	-5.512806	0.0000
DRP1	7.813201	2.128343	3.671026	0.0004
DRN3	-16.48617	1.603420	-10.28188	0.0000
DRP3	10.04597	1.866250	5.382972	0.0000
DRN4	-11.28902	2.430081	-4.645533	0.0000
DRP4	18.13720	4.173898	4.345387	0.0000
DR52	19.06853	5.291547	3.603584	0.0005
DR77	12.08724	3.994933	3.025643	0.0033
DR84	-10.47448	3.904179	-2.682889	0.0089
DR68	11.62812	4.067203	2.858996	0.0054

R-squared	0.938839	Mean dependent var	39.52602
Adjusted R-squared	0.924904	S.D. dependent var	14.06728
S.E. of regression	3.854944	Akaike info criterion	2.870949
Sum squared resid	1173.987	Schwarz criterion	3.372116
Log likelihood	-260.7325	F-statistic	67.37125
Durbin-Watson stat	2.196581	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000

Equation 1 corresponds to IWE as a dependent variable, while IWS and IWP are explanatory. The coefficient of both explanatory variables are clearly significant as can be observed in the column for the t- statistic. Therefore, the data favours the hypothesis that the socio- cultural environment (IWS) and the development of public services (IWP) affect positively and to a high degree economic development (IWE).

Equation 2 corresponds to IWS being the dependent variable and IWP and IWE the explanatory. The two explanatory variables have positive coefficients, but only IWE is

statistically significant, which supports the idea that family economic development is very important for the growth of IWS. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight the difference between countries with special effects amongst the mentioned; Spain, Ireland, Portugal, Greece with a socio cultural development lower than that which corresponds to the level of economic development.

Result of Estimation Equation 2.

LS // Dependent Variable is IWS
Sample: 1 98
Included observations: 98

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
IWP	0.024850	0.026508	0.937442	0.3512
IWE	0.056625	0.024396	2.321050	0.0227
C	49.71178	1.060195	46.88930	0.0000
D1	-37.09144	0.697436	-53.18260	0.0000
D2	21.53538	2.279175	9.448763	0.0000
D3	-16.16916	0.609528	-26.52732	0.0000
D4	13.09487	0.789663	16.58286	0.0000
D5	-12.64159	1.187725	-10.64353	0.0000
D6	-6.277556	0.995350	-6.306882	0.0000
D7	-21.43642	1.915903	-11.18867	0.0000
D8	-22.55903	2.009515	-11.22611	0.0000
D9	2.635273	1.137760	2.316195	0.0230
D10	-21.79553	1.167982	-18.66084	0.0000
D11	-32.13793	1.305964	-24.60858	0.0000

R-squared	0.990323	Mean dependent var	42.04109
Adjusted R-squared	0.988825	S.D. dependent var	17.29399
S.E. of regression	1.828186	Akaike info criterion	1.338212
Sum squared resid	280.7501	Schwarz criterion	1.707493
Log likelihood	-190.6283	F-statistic	661.2334
Durbin-Watson stat	2.008204	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000

Equation 3 corresponds to IWP being the dependent variable and IWE and IWS the explained. The equation shows IWS and IWE as having a positive influence on IWP.

The relationships among IWE, IWS and IWP are positive in all the equations, IWS having significative influence on both IWE and IWP, while IWE is more significant in explaining IWS than IWP. In turn IWP is more significant in explaining IWE than IWS.

Results of Estimation Equation 3.

LS // Dependent Variable is IWP
Sample: 1 98
Included observations: 98

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
IWS	0.419668	0.094508	4.440548	0.0000
IWE	0.112437	0.063551	1.769242	0.0806
C	-0.463211	4.097973	-0.113034	0.9103
D1	10.21834	3.185226	3.208043	0.0019
D2	39.90430	5.730165	6.963901	0.0000
D3	11.29081	1.736155	6.503344	0.0000
D4	10.07520	2.485311	4.053897	0.0001
D8	21.74301	5.333137	4.076965	0.0001
D9	29.76887	2.063924	14.42343	0.0000
DR8	18.08089	5.201553	3.476057	0.0008
D10	5.985370	3.151467	1.899233	0.0611
DR30	13.63668	5.152793	2.646463	0.0097
DR49	15.12203	5.279332	2.864384	0.0053
DR52	61.09226	5.897707	10.35865	0.0000
DR55	13.29194	5.128898	2.591578	0.0113
DR77	12.53533	5.334235	2.349977	0.0212

R-squared	0.910101	Mean dependent var	32.41163
Adjusted R-squared	0.893656	S.D. dependent var	15.34439
S.E. of regression	5.003865	Akaike info criterion	3.368703
Sum squared resid	2053.170	Schwarz criterion	3.790739
Log likelihood	-288.1224	F-statistic	55.34246
Durbin-Watson stat	2.386994	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000

4. PROBLEMS WITH THE UNITED NATION´S INDEXES.

Index for Human Development

The limited scope of the indices used in the UN studies do not allow for the appreciation of important aspects they could and, more so, should display and exhibit in their proper interpretation. A clear example of their mis- representation of data is that of Spain's.

The interpretation leads to the belief that Spain, despite spending very little on education, in fact considerably below that of other countries; portrays it as being above the rest. This is a clear example of mis-used data, as it has been confused with the fact that Spain's massified education system allows students to spend a greater number of years on their degree than should be the case, and hence interpreted as greater expenditure, therefore ranking 9th.

Two extreme cases displaying this distortion due to the indices are seen in both Spain and Luxembourg.

Many important factors (ie. variables considered in the construction of weights) which need to be considered and hence included in the elaboration of an appropriate index number for human development have been ignored such as employment opportunities, law and order, the environment, etc.

In general terms the main error of this index in its limited elaboration, is the concept of "income-equality", which assumes that the level of income per head between countries is minimal or non-existent , a most limited and erroneous assumption made, that does not take into account appropriately, the differences in rent per head between the countries.

Conclusion:

Taking Spain as an example in displaying the errors found in the indexes, Spain has been over-valued, due to the errors mentioned. If correct index numbers were to be constructed, (ie. taking into account budgets, grants, etc.) also, taking income in proportion with real income, Spain would then rank considerably lower; from occupying 9th place to 28th.

Index for Female Participation

Again, this index also requires greater care in its elaboration.

The results expressed in pages 90 and 91 represent Spain as occupying 26th place with a female participation index equal to 0.452 which translates as being 60% of the maximum value corresponding to Sweden with 0.757. In my opinion, Spain's position is over- valued due to the index containing an element that skews the result.

Spain should rank much lower in this index, yet we can appreciate how this occurs.

IFP is calculated using three indexes:

a) Political participation:

The UN uses the percentage of females in parliament. Spain's index is 14.6% which ranks among the first 50 (in the order of social change index). The average (14.34) considerably below the maximum value of 39.4 which corresponds to Norway.

b) Participation in director roles:

The UN uses the percentage of females in director posts in public administration and firms.

Spain's index here is very low, that of 9.5; considerably lower than the average which is 21.39 and a long way away from the maximum of 58.20 which corresponds to Hungary and 38.9 for Sweden.

c) Participation in professional posts:

This index is far from appropriate as it includes a very wide range of posts occupied by females.

The posts included here are those from the tertiary sector (teachers, nurses, doctors, architects, lawyers, etc). Hence, the significance is rather narrow because it can rank high in countries where female occupation is concentrated in a lower sector, as is the case for Spain. Spain ranks 47, an average of 47.8 and therefore above countries like France (41.4) which they surpass Spain in income (nearly double that of Spain). This index must be eliminated due to the distortions it causes in its results, and so not causing such great differences in the three other indicators.

d) Index for income from the corresponding employment post held:

The value of this index depends both on female participation in employment and the difference between male and female salaries. Spain's index is very low (18.6%) which is more than half that of Sweden's at 41.6% and below half of the first 50 countries with 21.28%.

Female participation in decision making in the home is however, represented rather satisfactorily in this index.

ANNEX

We present a Table regional Indices. The main data source is Statistical Yearbook Regions -Eurostat (1994)- and the figures are referred to year 1990. Other sources are UN (1995 a and b), Eurostat (1995a and b), OECD (1995) and IGLESIAS and NEIRA (1995) for Expenditure on Education and Health Assistance.

Missing data have caused great burden of extra work in our research but we consider ourselves fortunate in being able to present in this paper a wider view of the socio-economic indicators for the European Regions.

We cannot include all the tables, because of their big sizes, but we can send more information on request.

The following formulae express the relations between each Index of Well-being (IW i) and the distance indicators:

IW1 = 0.80 * D1A + 0.10 * D1B + 0.10 * D1C

IW2 = 0.75 * D2A + 0.25 * D1A

IW3 = 0.50 * D3A + 0.15 D3B + 0.15 * D3C + 0.20 * D3D

IW4 = 0.40 * D4A + 0.40 * D4B + 0.20 * D4C

IW5 = 0.75 * D5A + 0.25 * D5B

IW6 = 0.15 * D6A + 0.15 * D6B + 0.70 * D6C

Distance indicators:

D1A = VAB per head (proxy for Family Income).

D1B = Numer of dwellings per1000 inhabitants.

D1C = Number of cars per 1000 inhabitants.

D2A = Non-agrarian employment per 1000 inhab.

D2B = VAB per head (proxy for Wage Rate)

D3A = % of active population with level of education $\geq$. Second level.

D3B = Number of students (all levels) / population

D3C = Expenditure per head on eduacation (private and public).

D3D = Expenditure on Research and Development.

D4A = Number of doctors per 1000 inhab.

D4B = Number of hospital beds per 1000 inhab.

D4C = Expenditure on health assistance per head.

D5A = Rate of employment in Public Services.

D5B = Inverse of the number of trafic deaths per 1000 inhab.

D6A = % of female participation in politics.

D6B = % of female participation in management.

D6C = % of female participation in labour income.

	IW1	IW2	IW3	IW4	IW5	IW6
1 Galicia	16.93	11.60	20.21	26.97	15.31	7.44
2 Asturias	20.61	16.32	21.21	43.56	20.05	7.44
3 Cantabria	24.70	18.02	22.00	36.95	20.80	7.44
4 País Vasco	32.82	28.32	24.25	42.26	17.33	7.44
5 Navarra	34.62	32.72	22.64	57.83	17.43	7.44
6 Rioja	37.63	29.84	19.65	45.88	18.84	7.44
7 Aragón	29.92	25.13	20.15	44.37	23.40	7.44
8 Madrid	37.07	31.85	30.99	49.05	40.32	7.44
9 Castilla y León	21.07	14.31	20.73	36.17	20.94	7.44
10 Castilla-Mancha	20.82	10.26	17.27	23.38	15.75	7.44
11 Extremadura	10.31	1.75	17.65	20.11	21.17	7.44
12 Cataluña	36.90	31.78	22.26	39.67	12.74	7.44
13 Comunidad Valenciana	30.30	24.09	22.22	28.86	15.59	7.44
14 Baleares	46.78	35.66	19.49	27.61	17.45	7.44
15 Andalucía	15.90	7.41	23.36	29.45	20.95	7.44
16 Murcia	26.59	18.13	24.42	35.76	18.30	7.44
17 Canarias	25.87	15.72	25.59	29.48	26.50	7.44
18 Denmark	43.61	51.29	61.73	37.59	76.15	89.56
19 Piemonte	56.25	45.97	31.93	36.53	22.88	49.12
20 Valle d´Aosta	65.25	51.99	17.94	19.14	26.34	49.12
21 Liguria	52.34	40.26	21.56	49.15	38.41	49.12
22 Lombardía	61.11	51.97	26.73	43.55	18.31	49.12
23 Trentino-Alto Adige	52.20	52.48	20.45	40.47	41.16	49.12
24 Veneto	50.32	46.16	22.12	46.10	21.81	49.12
25 Friuli-Venezia Giulia	53.31	46.97	21.26	46.02	42.20	49.12
26 Emilia Romagna	58.05	49.17	22.25	44.38	22.92	49.12
27 Toscana	48.79	41.16	22.35	42.56	29.56	49.12
28 Umbría	39.49	35.56	22.18	43.25	36.08	49.12
29 Marche	45.76	42.36	22.31	46.38	28.25	49.12
30 Lazío	50.52	40.98	28.38	47.34	45.93	49.12
31 Campania	20.55	15.85	27.35	35.19	34.64	49.12
32 Abruzzi	34.96	29.80	25.15	46.49	31.30	49.12
33 Molise	26.61	19.96	21.19	41.92	29.09	49.12
34 Puglia	24.86	18.53	25.74	43.57	26.64	49.12
35 Basilicata	18.02	13.48	23.38	37.78	30.82	49.12
36 Calabria	17.59	6.23	23.88	38.83	31.10	49.12
37 Sicilia	22.95	13.35	25.98	40.81	35.11	49.12
38 Sardegna	24.99	20.40	26.23	34.14	31.47	49.12
39 Scheleswig-Holstein	43.61	38.51	61.53	52.27	48.15	65.87
40 Hamburg	90.73	78.37	66.92	73.49	57.33	65.87
41 Niedersachsen	42.02	39.06	64.61	52.68	40.08	65.87
42 Bremen	66.66	67.72	75.84	77.10	55.46	65.87
43 Nordrhein-Westfalen	47.79	43.46	67.79	61.70	43.72	65.87
44 Hessen	64.21	54.83	71.68	56.43	38.32	65.87
45 Rheinland-Pfalz	43.89	37.73	66.84	54.61	38.44	65.87
46 Baden-Wüttenberg	57.74	55.38	75.95	53.12	40.04	65.87
47 Bayern	53.77	52.17	75.14	56.50	35.11	65.87

	IW1	IW2	IW3	IW4	IW5	IW6
48 Saarland	44.42	42.58	59.93	58.99	43.95	65.87
49 Berlin	52.89	54.08	65.72	82.63	59.45	65.87
50 Vlaams Gewest	43.24	29.44	46.60	60.64	19.94	35.37
51 Region Wallomme	30.58	20.55	44.63	64.46	23.97	35.37
52 Bruxelles	78.75	96.47	50.82	83.00	88.39	35.37
53 Noord-Nederland	39.57	34.44	56.40	64.27	20.28	38.84
54 Ost-Nederland	33.05	38.08	55.54	62.85	26.42	38.84
55 West-Nederland	45.78	44.85	53.70	65.01	38.08	38.84
56 Zuid-Nederland	38.89	40.99	53.48	64.68	23.77	38.84
57 Luxembourg	57.12	57.24	39.65	63.97	22.49	24.75
58 Ireland	18.53	14.88	37.76	29.37	35.90	20.71
59 Norh U.K.	32.53	35.21	58.55	30.43	55.81	49.92
60 Yorkshire and H.	34.61	39.10	60.34	26.51	58.43	49.92
61 East Midlands	34.82	40.94	63.33	28.02	53.04	49.92
62 East Anglia	37.80	40.83	61.44	29.30	54.08	49.92
63 South-East	50.22	55.08	66.85	33.85	62.70	49.92
64 South-West	37.41	37.14	60.69	26.87	56.13	49.92
65 West-Midlands	33.45	41.20	63.02	29.80	60.65	49.92
66 NorthWest	37.98	39.14	63.01	27.09	61.52	49.92
67 Wales	33.87	29.11	57.97	34.90	60.50	49.92
68 Scotland	35.56	40.09	58.83	53.39	49.78	49.92
69 NorthernIreland	22.83	25.11	63.99	44.36	51.39	49.92
70 Norte Portugal	8.23	20.82	11.66	21.56	17.39	45.91
71 Centro Portugal	4.82	6.43	13.58	30.03	17.08	45.91
72 Lisboa e V. Tejo	23.35	31.39	15.73	36.40	31.27	45.91
73 Alentejo + Algarve	5.96	0.00	10.59	20.52	13.55	45.91
74 Voreia Ellada	7.32	3.83	6.85	28.93	4.73	30.51
75 Kentriki Ellada	10.43	12.83	7.05	40.26	9.77	30.51
76 Anatolika Kai Notia Nisia	8.22	4.32	6.40	24.46	7.03	30.51
77 Ille-de-France	77.79	61.67	64.52	66.25	45.73	59.14
78 Champagne-Ardenne	46.93	32.85	44.44	56.69	26.55	59.14
79 Picardie	37.11	26.72	46.30	56.94	20.69	59.14
80 Haute-Normandie	46.42	35.81	48.20	53.18	25.92	59.14
81 Centre	43.99	34.01	45.22	54.52	27.13	59.14
82 Basse-Normandie	40.06	29.70	44.81	59.62	26.11	59.14
83 Bourgogne	42.28	31.89	43.92	58.36	25.91	59.14
84 Nord-Pas-de-Calais	33.06	24.18	47.38	55.68	32.32	59.14
85 Lorraine	37.43	28.51	45.81	63.87	29.49	59.14
86 Alsace	46.85	39.05	46.37	70.18	27.00	59.14
87 Franche-Comté	42.54	32.57	49.73	59.20	26.59	59.14
88 Pays de la Loire	39.45	30.15	46.12	55.99	24.92	59.14
89 Bretagne	36.60	26.13	47.28	68.12	28.20	59.14
90 Poitou-Charentes	37.95	26.23	42.46	56.72	25.41	59.14
91. Aquitaine	42.62	28.95	45.87	68.01	25.78	59.14
92. Midi-Pyrénées	40.80	28.37	51.31	69.79	28.06	59.14
93. Limousin	37.52	26.61	40.46	69.10	27.56	59.14
94. Rhöne-Alpes	48.36	38.92	50.37	62.65	25.54	59.14

	IW1	IW2	IW3	IW4	IW5	IW6
95. Auvergne	38.59	28.15	45.67	65.80	26.90	59.14
96. Languedoc-Rousillon	37.37	21.20	45.75	71.58	22.97	59.14
97. Provence-Alpes-Côte d´Azur	44.54	30.89	47.35	75.92	28.48	59.14
98. Corse	35.25	22.25	NA	81.80	31.90	59.14

6.- REFERENCES

CUADRADO, J.R. et al. (1995): I*ntroducción a la Política Económica*. Capítulo 13. Mc Graw Hill.

DEHESA, G. de la, and KRUGMAN, P. (1992): *EMU and the Regions*. Group of Thirty Ocassional Paper, nº 39. Washington.

EUROSTAT (1994): *Statistical Yearbook , Regions*.

EUROSTAT (1995a): *Research and Development. Annual Statistics*.

EUROSTAT (1995b): *Social Portrait of Europe*.

GUISÁN, M.C. and CANCELO, M.T.(1996): "Territorial Public Expenditure and Revenue: Economic Impact in the European Regional Growth". ERSA. 36th European Congress.

IGLESIAS, A. and NEIRA, I. (1995): "Comparación Internacional del gasto público en sanidad y educación en países de la OCDE 1985-1990". IX Reunión de la Asociación Internacional de Economía Aplicada ASEPELT-ESPAÑA. Vol. I, pgs. 55-64.Santiago de Compostela, junio de 1995.

OECD (1995): *Education Statistics 1985-1992.* OECD París.

PENA, J.B. (1977): *Problemas de la medición del bienestar y conceptos afines*. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Madrid.

U. N. (1995a): *Rapport Mondial sur le developpment* 1995. Naciones Unidas.

U.N. (1995b): *Situación de la mujer en el mundo 1995*. Tendencias y estadísticas, serie k, nº12.